

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

---

<b>JAMES MARIO PRIDGEN,</b>	:	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>NO. 00-4561</b>
	:	
<b>SHANNON</b>	:	
<b>and</b>	:	
<b>THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE</b>	:	
<b>COUNTY OF LANCASTER</b>	:	
<b>and</b>	:	
<b>THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE</b>	:	
<b>STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA</b>	:	
<b>Respondents.</b>	:	
	:	

---

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 21st day of March, 2013, upon consideration of *pro se* petitioner's 60(b) Motion Alleging That the Federal Courts Misapplied the Federal Statute of Limitations Set Out in § 2244(d) (Document No. 53, filed October 11, 2012), Respondent District Attorney of Lancaster County's Answer to Petitioner's [sic] for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Document No. 56, filed December 10, 2012), and Petitioner's Response to Respondent's Answer to Petitioner's for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Document No. 57, filed December 20, 2012), for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum dated March 21, 2013, **IT IS ORDERED** that *pro se* petitioner's 60(b) Motion Alleging That the Federal Courts Misapplied the Federal Statute of Limitations Set Out in § 2244(d) is **DENIED**.

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois

---

**JAN E. DUBOIS, J.**